

# The Persecution of Heretics

Enjoined by the Present  
Public Ecclesiastical Law of the  
Church of Rome

Being Extracts from the Work of Pater Marianus de  
Luca, Professor of the Decretals in the  
Gregorian University of Rome

By the

**Rev. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D.**

Trin. Coll., Dub.; M.A., Exeter Coll., Oxon; Ph.D. of the University of Leipzig;  
Donnellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin (1880-1);  
Bampton Lecturer (1878); Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint (1893-7); and  
Public Examiner in Semitic Languages in the Honours School,  
University of Oxford (1894, 1895);  
Clerical Superintendent of the Protestant Reformation Society

1906

IMPERIAL PROTESTANT FEDERATION  
Dudley House  
36-38 Southampton Street, Strand  
London, W.C.

PRICE TWOPENCE, BY POST 2½d.; OR 12s. PER HUNDRED,  
CARRIAGE EXTRA

## PREFATORY NOTE

THE following tractate is taken from extracts from Professor Marianus de Luca's work given in Appendix III. of Dr C. H. H. Wright's work entitled *Daniel and its Critics, being a Critical and Grammatical Commentary*. London : Williams & Norgate, 14 Henrietta St., Covent Garden, 1906. The translation here given of Marianus de Luca is, with revision here and there, based on that given in "Jesuit Sedition and Inhumanity : The Contemporary Doctrines of Father Marianus de Luca, S.J., Professor of Canon Law in the Gregorian University; translated under the superintendence of Professor Margoliouth (University of Oxford)."

C. H. H. W.

*June 29, 1906.*

# The Persecution of Heretics

Enjoined by the present  
Public Ecclesiastical Law of the Church  
of Rome

THERE are few more remarkable productions of the twentieth century than the work entitled *Institutiones Juris Ecclesiastici Publici*, by P. Marianus de Luca, S.J., Professor in the Gregorian University of Rome. The work was warmly commended by the late Pope Leo XIII. in a letter addressed to its author, and printed on the greenish paper covers of each of the two volumes.<sup>1</sup> The full title of the book is appended

<sup>1</sup> Pope Leo XIII. says:—“Quid enim Ecclesiae sit juris, quaeque potestas, hac maxime tempestate quum omnia transversum aguntur, penitus nosse, non solum ad clerum attinet, verum etiam ceterorum deserit, ut sanctissimis legibus perducti propositum aeternae beatitatis non recte assequi contendant. ‘Libros autem tuos ad id merito esse compositos non doctrinarum modo atque eruditionis delectus, sed etiam dilucidus ordo satis ostendit. Nam Camilli Tarquini Cardinalis; tuique olim Gregoriano Athenaeo antecessoris vestigiis ingressus, perspicuitati insimul et rerum sinceritati in opere concionando imprimis consulis, apteque officia, quibus Ecclesia, pro natura ipsa societatis perfectae, luculenter regitur, ita prosequeris ut illis potissimum, qui in sacrarum disciplinarum spem adolescunt, utilitas haud dubia afferatur acre atque impensum canonum studium in se vel excitandi vel fovendi.’” The translation of this is:—

“For to know thoroughly whatever belongs to the law of the Church, and whatever power she possesses, especially at this time when all

below.<sup>1</sup> The book is drawn up in the old logical style and abounds with propositions, probationes, or syllogisms duly divided into their major and minor premisses with their middle terms. Divers corollaries from these also follow in logical order. All this arrangement renders the aspect of the book somewhat forbidding, even to the Latin reader of the present day. But these divisions are of no little use to those who desire to thoroughly understand its meaning, and who desire to "learn and inwardly digest" its teachings. No book more opposed to the spirit of our age has perhaps ever been issued from the Papal press.

The work opens with a preliminary statement concerning ecclesiastical law, and of the power of the Church of Christ considered in itself, apart from all human enactments. It then rapidly passes on to consider the Church as ";

things are perverted, not only concerns the clergy, but is of consequence to others, in order that, guided by most holy laws, they may strive rightly to attain the end of eternal felicity. But that your books are well devised for that purpose, not only the selection of doctrines and of erudition, but even your clear arrangement sufficiently shows. For, treading in the steps of Cardinal Camillus Tarquin, who was for some time your predecessor in the Gregorian Academy, you, in drawing up your work, have been specially anxious for the perspicacity and genuineness of the matter, and have suitably pointed out the offices by which the Church is clearly ruled in accordance with the nature itself of a perfect society, so that, especially for those who grow up in the expectation of the sacred disciplines the unquestioned advantage is afforded of arousing and cherishing in themselves an acute and earnest study of the canons."

<sup>1</sup> *Institutiones Juris Ecclesiastici Publici* quas juxta methodum Card. Tarquini traderat in Schola institutionem canonicarum P. Marianus de Luca, S.I. Nunc Textus Decretalium Professor in Universitate Gregoriana—Libraria Pontificia Friderici Pustet—Romae—Ratisbonae—Neo Eboraci, 1901 (vol. i., pp. 341; vol. ii. pp. 460).

perfect society," that is, a society which is complete in itself, furnished within itself with means for the attainment of the ends for which it has been called into being. Aristotle's definition of the State as such a perfect society is taken as a text, the additions made to Aristotle's definition by Thomas Aquinas being duly noticed.

In No. 44 the proposition is put forth, that by the will of its Divine Founder the Church of Christ is such a "perfect society" as Aristotle conceived the State to be. The proposition is considered to be proved by pointing out the absurdity of the contradictory view which would affirm that God had not provided for the Church of Christ all that was necessary to enable it to attain its objects. For it is argued, if the Church depended in any measure on civil society, that is, on the State, the right administration of the Church would be precarious. It is therefore maintained that it must have been the intention of Christ to establish His Church as "a perfect society"—in the highest sense. For if not, the Church would have been left to chance, and could not be upheld except by "a perpetual and daily miracle." These *a priori* arguments or assumptions abound in the work. The writer himself, and the ecclesiastical authorities who have so strongly recommended it, seem to have completely forgotten that, regarded from a *practical* point of view, the position contended for has been overthrown by the facts of history. For the position of the Church as "a perfect society," in Aristotle's sense, has from the beginning down to the present day been more than "precarious," and the "Perfect Society," as Professor de Luca would style it, has been unable to exercise for any long period the powers with which, it is maintained, she was Divinely provided as necessary for her existence.

Professor de Luca maintains on p. 123 the following:—

“*Prop. 2.—‘THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IS A PERFECT SOCIETY BY THE WILL OF ITS DIVINE FOUNDER.’*

*He maintains that this proposition can be proved in two ways, either by showing the absurdity of the contradictory, or by adducing positive evidence of such a Divine will.*

“*Prop. 2.—Section 1. It is absurd to say that the Divine Founder of the Church did not desire to constitute it a perfect society. Proof: It is absurd that our Lord Christ should not have provided sufficiently for His Church. But He would not have so provided unless He had given it a power embracing all means sufficient to the attainment of its end. And that is to have constituted a perfect Society. Therefore, etc.—PROOF OF MINOR. If the means to the attainment of the end of the Church depended on another society, that is, on civil society, 1. The right administration of the Church would be left to chance. 2. Its unity would be in perpetual danger, seeing how various are the counsels of different civil societies. 3. Throughout the last three centuries and even to-day the Church would in infidel countries have been handed over to her own enemies. And surely that is not to have provided for it well. Therefore Tarq.’s [Cardinal Tarquinius, S.J.] discourse is clear and easy to understand; but that the force of the argument may be seen the better, note: (1) In this *reductio ad absurdum* we speak according to the present order of divine providence, according to which Christ willed His Church to be governed without a miracle, or at least without a *perpetual and daily miracle*. (2) That three things must be supposed: (a) the true definition of the Church given above, (b) what the Catholic faith has handed down concerning the properties and marks of the Church, especially about the unity or uniqueness of*

the Church of Christ, (c) that at least the supreme end of the Church is different and distinguished from that of civil society. (3) That we must insist on the last threefold minor ‘if the means to the attainment. . . .’ *As to its first part*;—that the administration of the Church would be exposed to chance, like that of kingdoms, kings and constitutions, in this or that portion of the world, is evident. For they are continually undergoing various and many vicissitudes, sometimes even complete changes, which would altogether hinder the true worship of God, and that exercise of true religion which is essential to salvation. And as a thing which has not a fixed and stable cause, cannot itself either be fixed or stable, what would become of the immutability and indefectibility of the Church? Its right administration would depend on the will of princes, which is altogether changeable, and the Church would occupy the first place accidentally, and not essentially, and in virtue of its nature by divine institution. . . .

“As to the 2nd, *The unity of the Church would be called in question*. If the power of the Church were subordinated to the civil power in respect to the supply of means, the supreme authority of the Church would be, in each country, the civil power, to which the authority of the Church would be subordinated, and so there would be as many supreme authorities in it as there were States; that is, as many Churches as kingdoms: so the Church would no longer be one. The authority of the Church is the efficient principle of unity of the whole Catholic Church; for that is the function of authority in a society. So it cannot be subject to the civil power, because the civil power is manifold in the world, according to the diversity of

kingdoms and empires: so that it would have to act differently in different kingdoms, according to the pleasure of the kings, and it might happen that none of its laws or orders would be common to the whole Church. But authority, which is the efficient principle of unity or uniqueness in a society, demands that it be able to govern the whole society by common laws and statutes."

In No. 45, pp. 124 ff. of the original work, the writer maintains that it can be proved that Christ established His Church as "a perfect society." He first appeals to Holy Writ, citing Matt. xvi. 18, 19, xviii. 18. He next cites the authority of the Fathers, from pp. 125-127. He next gives the definitions of the Church, pp. 127-130, and deduces on p. 130 his Corollary I., namely:—

"From the proposition proved, the following corollaries flow:—

"*Corol. I.*—THEREFORE THE CHURCH OF CHRIST POSSESSES (1) LEGISLATIVE POWER, (2) DIVINE AND SUPER-NATURAL POWER, (3) POWER IN ALL MATTERS IN WHICH EITHER ESSENTIALLY OR ACCIDENTALLY, EITHER DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, THE PRINCIPLE OR NECESSITY OF THE SPIRITUAL END, THAT IS, OF THE CHURCH, CAN ARISE."

On p. 133 Professor de Luca deduces a second corollary:—

"*Corol. II.*—THEREFORE THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IS QUITE INDEPENDENT OF CIVIL SOCIETY DIRECTLY, AS WELL AS INDIRECTLY."

On p. 134 a third:—

"*Corol. III.*—THEREFORE THE SYSTEM OF WHAT IS CALLED ABSOLUTE LIBERALISM IS UTTERLY FALSE, ASSERTING

THE DEPENDENCE OF THE CHURCH ON THE STATE OWING  
TO THE SO-CALLED SUPREMACY OF THE STATE."

The fourth corollary is set forth at the bottom of p. 134 :—

*"Corol. IV.—THE CHURCH OF CHRIST POSSESSES NOT ONLY INTERNAL, BUT ALSO EXTERNAL JURISDICTION, OR (a) THE POWER OF EXERCISING JUSTICE, (b) AND THAT OF MAKING ITS MEMBERS MAGISTRATES."*

The fifth corollary, to which we desire to call particular attention, is set forth on p. 139 and following pages :—

*"Corol. V.—COERCIVE POWER BELONGS TO THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.*

*"Setting forth of the proposition.—*By coercive power is meant that which can coerce contumacious persons by the use of external force, whether they refuse to exercise the means laid down by the legislative power, or whether they refuse to obey the commands of the judicial power enjoining them duly to exercise those means, or whether finally they hinder the end of the society or its economy of means with regard to others: for the malice and obstinacy of men, and still more the necessity of natural vice, can only be kept in check by the application of external force. Hence a society must have the right of inflicting penalties sufficient for the preservation of its order. A penalty is an evil of suffering or privation inflicted on men whether they will or no, by public authority because of a crime, that all men may be deterred from disturbing the order of society.

*"Since a society can punish wrongdoers of this kind by a deprivation of their goods, and here the question is concerning a spiritual society, namely the Church, it*

## 8 *The Church has the Right to inflict Bodily Penalties*

follows that two kinds of deprivation can be distinguished in the Church : one is the deprivation of spiritual, the other of temporal or bodily goods. -

“ Further, in the imposition of penalties we must still distinguish the obligation of undergoing the penalty imposed by the sentence of the judge, and its execution. If the penalty consists in the deprivation of spiritual goods no execution is required. If the execution cannot be carried out without the use of physical force, then the help of some servants is required ; and their action is called *public force*.

“ Finally, a distinction must be made between the judicial power of compulsion and the actual faculty of carrying it out. The former is valid without the latter : hence a few facts on the other side prove nothing against the right.

“ In connection with the coercive power of the Church several questions might be raised : 1. In general, whether it possesses the right of inflicting penalties *efficient* to the attainment of its end and the preservation of social order.

“ 2. *Of what kind* the penalties to be inflicted by the Church may be ; whether they can be *bodily* too ; that is, of the quality and kind of the penalties which the Church can inflict. 3. How great they can be, that is, of the severity of penalties, specifically, or, whether the right of inflicting them extends as far as capital punishment. 4. Specially about the court of the Inquisition ; and 5. Of armed force.

“ Before we begin the solution of the first general question, we call to mind two things. 1st—That the Church is a Society which is (a) religious, (b) perfect, (c) composed of men. Hence the distribution of means

must be determined partly from the nature of the end, partly from the character of the subject using them. 2nd—Use of physical force can be made in two ways : (a) *immediately*, in as far as its servants, set up by it and receiving their authority immediately from it, exercise external force ; (b) *mediately*, in as far as the Church commands secular Rulers to use that force in its defence, by checking any violence, punishing the obstinate, compelling the disobedient to obey.”

On p. 140 the writer goes on to say that :—

“ 1.—*Coercive Power and the right of Inflicting Penalties belong to the Church.*

“ I speak generally, and prove that coercive power and the right of inflicting penalties belong to the Church of Christ. For we have seen (a) that in a perfect society legislative and judicial power itself falls to the ground unless coercive power is added to them, for they would fail of their effect for the good of society just where there was need of it, namely against the obstinate and unwilling. Hence the supreme Ruler of a State is usually represented, not only as holding in his hands a balance with poised scales, as an emblem of the justice of the law courts, but also as girded with a sword, to show his punitive power. Hence *Suarez De Fid. disp. xx. sect. 3* : ‘ The power of punishing criminals is necessary in every well-constituted State to its preservation and good government. So evident is this that, *apart from Faith and divine revelation, all men have, by the force of reason, understood that this is a natural power*, given by the Creator of Nature, by the very fact of men’s gathering together into the mystic body of any State. But our

Lord Christ instituted the Church to be a single mystical body, to be led by one faith to a single supernatural end. So He left in it the power of punishing and coercing the malefactors who can do most hurt to this body, and most disturb it from the end at which it aims.'<sup>1</sup>

"(b) Our assertion is evident from *Ioan. xxii. Const. licet*: 'Fifthly, these blasphemers further say that the whole Church put together cannot inflict on a single man coercive punishment unless the Emperor grants it: which is certainly known to be at variance with the doctrines of the Gospels.'

"It is certain from *Matt. [xviii. 15-17]* that if anyone wrongly inflicts an injury on another, and refuses to make it good at the command of the Church, the Church can, by the power granted to it by Christ, compel him by sentence of excommunication to do so, and that is certainly a coercive power. Respecting this we must observe, that since the major excommunication not only cuts a man off when excommunicated from receiving the sacraments, but also excludes him from intercourse with the faithful, Christ has given the Church the right of bodily coercion, it being severer. . . ."

In order to show that bodily coercion is granted, and at any rate not denied, to the Church, or declared to be unsuitable to it, *de Luca* adduces the examples (a) of Ananias and Sapphira, (b) of Elymas the sorcerer, (c) of the Corinthian fornicator; with (d) *1 Cor. v. 21*: *What will ye? I will come to you with a rod*,—*The arms of our*

<sup>1</sup> "Sed Christus Dominus instituit Ecclesiam ut esset unum corpus mysticum per unam fidem perducendum ad unum supernaturalem finem. *Ergo reliquit in illa potestatem ad puniendos et coercendos malefactores, qui maxime huic corpori nocere possunt, et ab illo fine, quo tendit, perturbare.*"

*warfare are not carnal, but of the power of God [2 Cor. x. 4; explaining the last words as granted by God]; being ready to punish all disobedience.*

Thus de Luca finally notes (p. 140) that the Pope concludes that the arguments used against the Church's possession of coercive power are (1) contrary to Scripture, (2) hostile to the Catholic faith, (3) heretical or appertaining to heresy and error.

The Professor further argues that: "*Our opponents say: To inflict temporal penalties there must be material force. And the Church has not this force: therefore its right of punishing is useless.* (b) *If the Church possessed such a right, it would have exercised it against its persecutors from the very beginning of its existence: so if it exercised it from Constantine onwards, that is a certain proof that it acquired such a right from the Emperors, to be exercised at their pleasure. . . .*"

To their objections de Luca gives the following answers, p. 141:—

"*Answer 1.—Indirectly.* Does not the civil ruler himself possess this material force inasmuch as he has the right of demanding it from the soldiers subject to him? Now the same must be said of the Church in a proportionate relation. For the Church has the right of demanding the necessary material force from the prince himself. So if the Church is for that reason to be said to lack material force, the secular prince must be said to lack it too.

"But it is said: What if the prince refused to obey the Church? Where would its rights be then?

"I answer: What if the soldiers refused to obey the ruler—what would become of his right?

"*Answer 2.—Directly.* To constitute a right it is not

necessary that a man should always exert it immediately : he can exert it, if necessary, either himself, or through others more or less mediately.

“That is why we said that a perfect society, to be self-sufficient, must have sufficient means either *actually* or *virtually* at least, whether essentially or implicitly. It possesses them formally, when it need in no wise demand them from another society ; *by its own right*, when this other society can neither deny it such means, nor finally decide whether they are to be granted. And as the Church needs the secular arm for the infliction of several penalties, it does possess such a right in relation to civil rulers, so that they are in no wise empowered of themselves to refuse material force necessary in the opinion of the Church. So the Church *does not lack this material force* : for although it has it not *actually*, nor *essentially*, yet it has it *implicitly*, that is, by virtue of the right it has of always being able to demand it from a civil society of Christians.<sup>1</sup>

“This opinion is common to all Theologians and Canonists alike. Let the Abbot of Clairvaux D. Bernard stand in place of them all. He, writing to Engenius, says : ‘Now *both swords* must be used . . . and by whom if not by you ? *Both belong to Peter* : they must be unsheathed as often as is necessary, one at your pleasure, the other by your hand.’ Indeed this is the opinion of the Catholic Church laid down by Pope

<sup>1</sup> Atqui Ecclesia quoad plures poenas infligendas cum indigeat brachio saeculari, tali iure proprio gaudet in Principes civiles adeo ut hi nullatenus ipsi vim materialem iuxta Ecclesiae iudicium necessarium denegare valeant. Hac igitur vi materiali non carat Ecclesia : quia etsi in ea desit *re et formaliter*, habetur tamen *virtualiter* h. e. virtute iuris sui, quo a societate civili Christianorum semper repetere possit.

Boniface VIII. *Constit. Unam Sanctam de Maioritate et obedientia*, at the passage: ‘Lo, here are two swords . . . each then is in the power of the Church, viz., the spiritual and the material sword, but the latter must be exercised for the Church, the former by the Church. The former by the hand of the priest, the latter by that of kings and soldiers, *but at the pleasure and will of the priest.*’ Here no one doubts that under the name of the material sword is meant *the whole power of civil society*, including that of coercion, indeed that this is specifically declared, as it is said at the end: to be exercised by the hand of Rulers and *soldiers*. Now the Royalists very greatly exaggerate: 1. The truly coercive power of a perfect society, they say, must have all that pertains to an effective sanction; 2. That this power must at least in right extend to the right of the sword, which they deny the Church, together with the right of inflicting bodily penalties.

“To the 2nd. It would have exercised it from the beginning against its persecutors. . . . Distinguish: if there had been an opportunity and severer harm was not to be feared from its use, *I grant it*: if not, *I deny*.

“To the 3rd. *Distinguish*: The arms of our warfare are not carnal in respect of their power and efficacy, because they are from God: *I admit*. That they are not carnal in respect of their subject and the matter with which they are concerned: *I deny.*”

The Professor, therefore, proceeds to state in even plainer language on p. 142:—

“II.—*The Church of Christ possesses the right of inflicting bodily penalties, even of Death.*

“When the inviolable right of any society begins to be impugned and denied it, then that society must insist on

it most emphatically, and assert it strenuously. Now we see that in this age of ours, if ever, the right of inflicting on the guilty the severest penalties according to need—viz., what is called the right of the sword, has been denied to the perfect society, and that the penalty of death lies hidden and buried among obsolete rights. And in respect of the Church of Christ, which Catholics must necessarily admit to be perfect, nay, the most perfect, the Royalists are wont to deny it the right of inflicting temporal penalties: which plainly is the same as to assert that the Church ought *to be foolish in the penalties which it inflicts*. For not only *the principles of social right*, but even the *general principles* of reason show that the nature and character of means—from the very fact that they are *means*, that is, that they are employed, not on their own account, but on account of something else that we wish to attain through them,—cannot be absolutely determined by the means themselves, but that they must be determined with regard to the necessity of the end, that is, with regard to the necessity of obtaining that for which they are employed. For suppose that, as daily experience shows us is the case, there are some who despise spiritual penalties, and so cannot be restrained by them from disturbing the order of the Church, what, I ask, can be more foolish than to inflict such spiritual penalties on them, and to refrain from employing temporal penalties, the only ones which can be of any use? Taparellius truly says: that would be just like punishing a boy who disliked school by shutting him out of school: unless he sees some other penalty added to this he will of course be delighted and glad, and will not amend at all, but become more obstinate than ever in his fault. The Church would incur the blame of equal folly

if it would fain punish those who despise spiritual goods by depriving them of those goods. And since this error is widely spread, we must note that it has been condemned not once only. Especially in *Constit. dogm.* Ioan. xxii. ; beginning *Licet*, written against Marsilius of Padua ; and most recently by the R. Pope Pius IX. in *Const. ad Apostolicæ*, where two books of Nepomucenus Nuyts are condemned. The first of his errors that is condemned, is the statement that 'the Church has not the power of inflicting forcible penalties and that it has no temporal power direct or indirect.' Against the Royalists then and their modern followers we assert the punitive power of the Church as embracing even the power of the sword. We are justified in beginning by vindicating this right of the Church, both because of the adversaries who, because the penalty of death has long been pronounced against heretics, and specifically against certain heresiarchs and apostates, slander our holy mother the Church and cry out against her with all their might and accuse her of acting unjustly and wrongly,—and because men argue from the right of inflicting capital punishment to milder penalties. Afterwards we shall come to damnatory judgments, namely the right of the severest penalty, which is excommunication.<sup>1</sup>

"*Proof 1. From reason and social right.*—We must go to the origin, basis and end of penalties to arrive at their degree, proportion and nature. Now the origin, basis

<sup>1</sup> Recentissime a R. Pontifice Pio IX in *Const. Ad Apostolicæ*, in qua duo libri damnantur Nepomuceni Nuyts, inter cuius errores hic primus notatur quod asseruerit "Ecclesiam vis inferendæ potestatem non habere, neque temporalem ullam potestatem sive directam sive indirectam." Contra Regalistas igitur horumque modernos asseclas tantam asserimus Eccl. coactivam potestatem, quae etiam ius gladii complectatur. Merito ab hoc iure vindicando

and end of penalties in a perfect society demands that it be empowered to exercise the right of the sword. Further, the Church is a perfect society : Therefore :—*Note on Major*—Punishment is nothing but a means of securing the preservation of order : and the character, proportion, and nature of means must be determined by the necessity of the end, that is, must be of such a nature as certainly to produce that end.

“*Note on Minor Premiss.*—A society has the right to take steps for its own security, and to use efficient means to defend itself against everything that can upset public order. Further, social authority is bound to do all it can by the infliction of penalties to destroy the impulse to crime which springs from the criminal’s bad example. And it may well happen that no other penalty may be an efficient means to check the infection of crime and preserve the order of society, but the penalty of death.

“For the character of some men is so vicious and inclined to crime, that society must fear for the greatest evils to itself from them unless it absolutely removes from them all power of doing harm, and in a large number of men there may be several who can scarcely be restrained from crime by the threat of death. Every other punishment must leave some hope of escape, and they make light of it when they compare it with the pleasure and the profit which they believe they can derive

Ecclesiae exordimur tum propter adversarios qui ob iamdiu decretam haereticis mortem et nominatim nonnullis haeresiarchis et Apostatis illatam, s. matrem nostram Ecclesiam ceu iniuste et inique agentem traducunt plenisque buccis inclamant, tum propterea quod ex poenae capitalis infligendae iure ad mitiores poenas arguitur. Tandem ad censuras nominatim ad gravissimae poenae ius, quae est excommunicatio perveniemus.

from crime. And if this is so, who does not see that (*a*) *the penalty of death is the one efficient means to the security of the society*? [the italics are ours]. Because indeed the right of society to security is altogether superior to the right to live in which the criminal trusts. We said that (*b*) *this right belonged to a perfect society* [italics ours], for if it did not possess this, the only efficient and therefore necessary means in these cases, it would not contain within itself all the means that were sufficient and necessary to its end ; in other words, it would not be a perfect society. I said (*c*) *the Church is a perfect society ; and that we assume as proved. Then the right of the sword is a necessary and effective means to the attainment of its end* [the italics are ours], if obstinate rebels against the Church and disturbers of ecclesiastical peace and unity, and especially stubborn heretics and heresiarchs, cannot be prevented by any other penalty from continuing to disturb the order of the Church and from stirring up others, who are always ready to do wrong and especially to sin against the Church. In actual fact, the Church at first dealt more leniently with heretics, excommunicating them, confiscating their property . . . till at last she was compelled to inflict the extreme penalty : 'secondly experience shows (says *Bellar. de laicis* l. 3, c. 21) that there is no other remedy : for the Church gradually advanced, and tried every means, *first excommunication alone, then a pecuniary fine was added, then exile, FINALLY SHE WAS COMPELLED TO FALL BACK ON DEATH* [the capitals here are the author's own]. Heretics despise excommunication and say that that bolt is powerless ; if you threaten them with a pecuniary fine, they neither fear God nor respect men, knowing that they will find fools enough to believe them and support them. If you imprison them or send them

into exile they corrupt those near them with their words and those at a distance with their books. So THE ONLY REMEDY IS TO SEND THEM SOON TO THEIR OWN PLACE<sup>1</sup> [capitals are the author's]. The society of the Church and its public order, against the disturbance of which there are many ecclesiastical charges, must necessarily be preserved, that men's souls may be sanctified by the true faith and good works, and that they may gain eternal salvation.<sup>1</sup>

“II. Indeed, if this right of the sword did not belong to the Church, the reason would be either that it is opposed to the nature or end of the Church, or that it contradicts natural right and divine positive law ;— and neither of these is the case. I. *It does not conflict with* (a) *the end of the Church.* On the contrary, that end demands it, for it is the duty of the Church to look to the sanctification and salvation not of one, but of all. This involves an external ecclesiastical order, which has been laid down partly by our Lord, partly by the Church herself. So, when the vice of one or of a few involves the ruin of many of her sons, she is bound absolutely to

<sup>1</sup> “Secundo experientia docet (ait *Bellar. de laicis l. 3 c. 21*) non esse aliud remedium : nam *Ecclesia paullatim progressa est*, et omnia remedia experta ; *primo solum excommunicabat* ; *deinde addidit multam pecuniarum, tum exilium* ; *ULTIMO COACTA EST AD MORTEM VENIRE* : nam excommunicationem contemnunt haeretici, ac dicunt esse fulmina frigida : si mineris multam pecuniarum nec Deum timent, nec homines reverentur, scientes non defuturos stultos, qui illis credant, et a quibus alantur ; si in carcerem concludas vel in exilium mittas corrumput vicinos verbis, et longe positos libris, **ERGO SOLUM REMEDIUM EST MITTERE ILLOS MATURE IN LOCUM SUUM.**” Ordo porro publicus socialis ecclesiasticus, contra quem turbandum sunt plurima crimina ecclesiastica, est necessario servandus ad animarum sanctificationem per rectam fidem et per bona opera atque ad aeternam salutem obtainendam (p. 143).

remove that vice, and, if no other remedy avails to save her people, she may, and must, inflict the penalty of death on such vicious men. This course we see the Church has taken in the case of obstinate heretics . . . and the Church justly fears those who cannot but threaten to disturb the order of her society and to impel others to corruption. Here we might argue *ad hominem* against those who suppose that the right of the sword, or the extreme penalty, conflicts with the end of the Church, namely, the salvation of souls—for then the State cannot boast in the right of the sword either, inasmuch as its end is subordinate to the end of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

“(b) *It does not conflict with natural right.* For the principle of the preservation and peace of society, which is the only principle drawn from natural right which can support the exercise of that power in civil society, *holds good for the Church on even stronger grounds*, since the preservation of the Church is far more important than that of civil society. . . .”

Omitting much which bears on this question, we

<sup>1</sup> *Non contradicit fini Eccl.* quin imo id exigit ille: ad Ecclesiam enim spectat non unius sed omnium curare sanctificationem et salutem necessario ordine externo ecclesiastico partim a Christo Dno., partim ab ipsa Eccl. determinato: ergo cum unius vel aliquorum pravitas posita sit in ruinam multorum filiorum, tenetur illam auferre efficacius ita ut si nullum aliud suppetat remedium, ut salvet populum suum, possit ac debeat eiusmodi pravis hominibus mortem infligere. Quod factum fuisse videmus ab Eccl. quoad obstinatos haereticos . . . et eos a quibus nonnisi periculum perturbandi ordinem socialem ecclesiasticum et impulsu m persionis praebendi coeteris, merito timet Ecclesia. Hinc ad hominem responderi posset iis, qui autumant ius gladii seu extremum supplicium contradicere fini Ecclesiae i. e. saluti animarum.—Scil. ergo neque status gaudebit iure gladii quandoquidem finis status est subordinatus fini Ecclesiae (pp. 143, 144).

pass on further to p. 145, and find on that page the following :—

“ Even if we grant (what we do not admit) that the Church has never used such a right, (a) it does not follow from that that it has not the right or power ; for it is an illicit inference from the fact that a thing is not, to the statement that it cannot be ; (b) and even if the immediate exercise of such a right were denied, the negation of the right does not follow—it is enough that it be possessed virtually ; that is, that *mediately* at any rate such a right belong to the supreme Magistrate of the Church, that he may demand of a Catholic Ruler that he inflict that penalty on wrong-doers if the necessity of the Church demands it. Cavagnis himself (*l.c.* § 308) observes : ‘ For if we granted that the Church needed the infliction of capital punishment in its own defence, and hence that it could invoke the help of the prince, it would then *itself be exercising* the right of the sword *mediately* : but the capital punishment would always be inflicted in its name, and the prince would only act as instrument. But an action is attributed to the person who commands that it be done, as its principal author, not to the person who carries it out as an instrument : thus the death of a criminal is attributed at law to the prince or judge, rather than to the executioner.’ But that this right belongs at any rate mediately to the Church is certainly established by the authority of Doctors. Indeed there are some among them who pass the severest condemnation on those who deny such a power to a Roman Pope or an *Œcuménical* Council. This will appear below when an argument is adduced on the authority of Doctors to the effect that ‘ *it is universally stated that the Church can inflict on heretics the penalty of death*,’ which, as Suarez says ; ‘ *all the*

*Controversialists show against the Innovators,' says Card. Albitius de Inconst. in fide c. 21, n. 1.* Now the common assertion of all these would be worthless, unless it were understood that *the Church had that authority at least mediately*. Moreover, (c) more than this—it has exercised the power directly too; and Answer 2, the Church (a) *has exercised the power* [italics are the author's], (b) has practically done so directly. For its direct exercise does not involve that the Ministers of the Church should carry into effect the judgment of the Ruler of the Church like executioners [*tamquam carnifex*, or 'as butchers']; it is enough that the ecclesiastical magistracy pronounce the penalty of death in the particular case, and that the civil prince is bound by an absolute obligation to provide the Church with secular judges and servants to carry out her sentences. As far as executing the judgment of the Church goes, it makes no difference whether the servants of justice be immediately subordinated to the supreme magistrate of the Church himself, or whether there is a military force under the civil prince, which must always be ready to put into execution this right of the sword. For the members of a society are immediately and directly subordinated to the power of the society in those matters which are necessary to its end.<sup>1</sup> And civil society, with

<sup>1</sup> Non est enim necesse ad immediatum exercitium ut Ecclesiae Ministri *tamquam carnifex*, Ecclesiae magistratus ius exerceant; sed sufficit ut hic Magistratus Ecclesiasticus sit mandans mortis in casu particulari, ita ut indeclinabile ministerium Princip. civili insit Ecclesiae praestandi iudices et excutores saeculares: nam ad iudicij Eccl. effectum obtinendum perinde est quod penes ipsum Ecclesiae supremum magistratum reperiatur constitutos esse ministros iustitiae, vel penes Principem civilem manum militum, qui omnes ad hoc ius gladii exercendum parati esse debent: membra enim societatis immediate et directe subduntur, potestati societatis in iis, quae ad huius finem necessaria sunt (pp. 145-6).

its prince and army, are members of the Church. Therefore, in matters which concern the Church as being necessary to its ends, they must be immediately subject to its authority and guidance. But the exercise of material force, even to the point of inflicting death, say, on a heretic, is a necessary means to the salvation of Christ's faithful, which is the end of the Church.

“For (1) Doctors deny that such a right has never been exercised, without making any distinction between mediate and immediate exercise of it—see Bellarm. in quoted passage. (2) They [the civil authorities] must perform the prescribed service or duty in question when the Church thinks fit and has made her own civil laws which impose this penalty. (3) One who broke away from the authority of the Church was *outlawed*, so that all men were given the power of killing him with impunity (see Suarez *De fide Disp.* xx. sect. 3, n. 23). (4) After the matter has been handed over to secular princes and judges, they are bound, under pain of excommunication, immediately to carry out the sentence imposed, without revising the action of the ecclesiastical court. Therefore, the Church herself has exercised such a right.

“Further, many Doctors, *e.g.* Suarez, assert that this right belongs primarily to the Church, and secondarily to the civil prince, after the fashion described in *Bulla Unam Sanctam Extravag. com. de Maior. et obed.*, namely, that the material sword is subordinated to the spiritual, and depends on the nod and wish of the Priest, as one who stands between him who gives the command and him who receives it, between the master and the servant.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Porro DD. plurimi aiunt *e. g.* Suarez hoc ius principaliter pertinere ad Ecclesiam et secundario Principi civili, eo prorsus modo, qui per *Bullam Unam sanctam Extravag. com. de Maior. et obed.*

*“3rd Objection.—Because this punishment does not amend the criminal himself. I answer by denying the assumption that every penalty,—especially when imposed by the Church,—must always carry with it the improvement of the criminal [the italics are ours]: for if that assumption is true no other penalty either can be inflicted but such as certainly involves the reformation of the criminal, and that is not the case. The reformation of the criminal and the requital made to the person injured are demanded, not absolutely, but in so far as they are called for by the end and constitution of the society in question. And although the private guidance of every individual is also included in the end of the Church, whence the frequent use in it of medicinal punishments, yet we must always bear in mind what has previously been proved, that the main foundation and end of penalties rests on the necessity of preserving the order of society.”*

“Now our opponents admit that the safest means of defending the society of the Church is to deprive the criminal of the possibility of doing harm: but they say the extreme penalty is unnecessary, because perpetual imprisonment sufficiently attains that object. I answer that just as perpetual imprisonment is insufficient for the preservation of civil order, so it is insufficient for the preservation of ecclesiastical order. And indeed the good that is most necessary to the Church is the unity of the true faith, and that cannot be preserved unless the heretic be handed over to death. See Bellarm. as before.

*“4th Objection: from the authority of Doctors, as denying such a right. Answer 1st. I deny the assertion to be*

describitur gladius sc. materialis sub spirituali sit sc. ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis sc. qui est inter mandantem et mandatarium, Dominum et servum: atqui . . . e, (p. 146).

granted. So far is what these opponents say from being true, that, as Tarq. observes, the severest condemnation has more often been passed on such as deny the Church the fullest power, extending even to the right of the sword. Answer 2nd. Those doctors either explain Pontifical Law ; then they are concerned with determined right as regarding inferior clergy subordinate to that law, and not with determining right, the bearer of supreme power, like a Roman Pope and an Ecumenical Council. Or else they deal with a question not of right but of fact ; then they only mean that the Church was not in the habit of doing that, as they understand it.”

Professor Marianus de Luca proceeds then on p. 147 to cite :—

“ *IV.—Proof from the authority of Doctors.*

“ Cardinal Albitius *De inconstantia in fide* c. xxi. says : ‘First comes capital punishment, *which the Church justly inflicts on Heretics*, as is shown by all the Controversialists against the Innovators.’ In the same place he cites Valencia, Bellarm. Becan. Alphon. De Castro, Suarez, Covaruvias, Simoneta, Farinacius, Carena, Del Bene—passages cited there.

“ No. 3, he adds : ‘Reason itself shows that this is so, since the State has the power of punishing its subjects and inflicting a penalty proportionate to the severity of the offence, and there is no graver offence than heresy owing to the harm it does to the Christian State,—and, therefore, it must be rooted out with fire and sword.’ So in *cap. Resecanda* 24, *q. 3*, *Innoc. ep. 25, D. Tom. 2. 2. q. 11, art. 3 and 4*, and *Bannes and Gregorius de Valentia—Suarez de Fide disp. 23. sect. 1. n. 5—De*

Lugo *disp. xxiv.*, *sect. 2. n. 36*—and our own Farinac. *q. 189, n. 4.*

“No. 5. ‘This penalty is inflicted by ecclesiastical Judges when unrepentant or relapsed heretics are given over to the secular arm to be punished by them’ to the text in *Cap. ad abolendam § praeterea* at the words ‘*let him be left to the secular power to deal with, to receive the punishment he deserves.*’ And in the § *laicus* at the words: ‘*let him be left to the secular judge to deal with, to receive the requital he deserves for the nature of his crime*’—*extra de Haereticis* at the words *omnes canonistae*.<sup>1</sup>

“No. 6. So when heretics have been left to the secular arm, the judges must inflict on them the penalty not of death only but of fire:—how old this penalty of fire is in the Church, is shown by D. Greg. 1. 1, *Dialog. c. 4*;

<sup>1</sup> *IV. Prob. auctoritate DD.* Cardinalis Albitius De inconstantia in fide c. XXL haec habet n. 1. “*Et prima est poena capitalis qua iuste puniuntur ab Ecclesia Haeretici ut docent omnes Controversistae contra Novatores*” et ibidem nominat Valencia—Bellarmi.—Becan.—Alphon. De Castro—Suarez—Covaruvius—Simoneta—Farinacius—Carena—Del Bene. II. ibidem c t.

N. 3 addit “*Et suadet ipsa ratio, quia Respublica habet potestatem puniendi subditos poena condigna iuxta delicti gravitatem, sed nullum gravius delictum est haeresi propter nocumentum, quod assert reipublicae christiana, et ideo igne et ferro resecandum ut in cap. Resecanda 24 q. 3. Innoc. ep. 25—D. Tom. 2. 2, q. 11, art. 3 et 4 et ibi Bannes et Gregorius de Valentia—Suarez de Fide *disp. 23. sect. 1. n. 5.*—De Lugo *disp. XXIV. sect. 2. n. 36.*—ex nostris Farinac. q. 189. n. 4.*

N. 5. “*Haec autem poena tunc imponitur a Iudicibus ecclesiasticis, quando haeretici imponitentes, seu relapsi relinquuntur brachio saeculari, ut ab eis puniantur ad textum in Cap. Ad abolendam § praeterea in illis verbis: “saecularis relinquatur arbitrio potestatis animadversione debita puniendus.” Et in § laicus, ibi saecularis iudicis arbitrio relinquatur, debitam recepturus pro qualitate facinoris ultiōnem—extra de Haereticis et ibi omnes canonistae*” (pp. 146, 147).

and all the Doctors note the fact on C. *ad abolendam de Haeret.* P. *del Bene* p. 1, dub. 162, pet. 5, n. 25.

“ Suarez 2 de Fide Disp. xx., sect. 3. n. 28, says: ‘Nevertheless it is a Catholic tenet that the Church may justly inflict on heretics the penalty of death.’ Cp., too, n. 23.

“ Bellarmin’s opinion we saw above. We cannot stay to dwell on many others, see them in *Del Bene* throughout his famous work quoted above: and in general cp. the great Canonists dealing with cases of mixed jurisdiction in *tit. de foro compet.* It will be enough for us to support this catholic doctrine by the opinion of St Thomas (2. 2. q. 11, a. 3). In that passage he says, ‘Respecting heretics, there are two things to be considered, one affecting them, the other affecting the Church. As concerning themselves, their sin is such as to deserve not only separation from the Church by excommunication, but even removal from the world by death. For it is a far more serious offence to corrupt the faith, on which hangs the life of the soul, than to forge money which supports our life on earth. So if debasers of coin or other malefactors are with justice handed over to death immediately by secular Rulers, far more may heretics, as soon as they are convicted of heresy, be with justice, not excommunicated only, but even put to death [the italics are the author’s].—On the side of the Church, however, there is pity for the conversion of the erring, and so she does not condemn them at once, but after the first and second correction, as the Apostle teaches [Titus iii. 10]. But if after that he still be found obstinate, the Church, having no more hope of his conversion, provides for the salvation of others by separating him from the Church by sentence of excommunication; and for the rest she leaves him to the secular judgment, to be cut off from

*the world by death.'* With this agrees the Theological Faculty of Paris, which went further, and in 1526, in censuring Erasmus *on the punishment of heretics*, taught that heretics not only may, but even ought to have the extreme penalty passed on them. It says: 'Since it is a Catholic tenet which must be faithfully held, that the extreme penalty not only may, but must be inflicted on obstinate heretics, when that can be done without detriment or danger to the State, and their salvation and that of the rest can by no other means be attained and preserved. The contrary opinion is an error of the Cathari, the Waldenses and Luther, and has been condemned by general councils and imperial laws.' Comp. *D. Argentree Collect. Jud. 1. 2.*, pag. 1, pag. 69.

"Surely this consentient opinion of the Doctors cannot but express the established teaching of the Church. The same point is directly proved by the following :

"V.—*The Acts of the Church and its Teaching show the Right of the Sword.*

"1st. *C. ad abolendam* and many other passages of the Law prove it. In them (a) none but an ecclesiastic can judge a capital case on a charge of heresy, 'and his decisions cannot be revised before being carried into effect.' (b) It is laid down that the heretic suffer the penalty or punishment he deserves; that is, the meaning of the Church is, that the capital penalty be inflicted on them, or they be driven from off the land, as it had been laid down in the Emperor's law. (c) It is proved by facts and by history: for many heretics have been put to death and burnt by the secular arm, merely after an ecclesiastical trial, because heresy is a purely ecclesiastical crime. Hence the practice which held good for several

centuries, that the heretic should be handed over to the secular arm, and be burnt without any revision of his case or any delay.

“2. *The Lateran Council iv. c. 3 lays down*—‘If a temporal Lord, in spite of the demands and exhortations of the Church, has neglected to cleanse his realm from this pollution of heresy, let the Metropolitan and the other bishops of the land lay the chain of excommunication upon him, and if he refuse to give satisfaction within a year, let the Pope be informed of this, that he may then himself declare that the ruler’s vassals are free from allegiance towards him, and give the land for the Catholics to occupy, that they may *exterminate the heretics* [the italics are the author’s], and so possess it undisputed.’

“3. Innocent IV., with the approval of the Fathers of the 1st *Œcuménical Council of Lyon*, issued a constitution enumerating many crimes of the Emperor Frederick II., and, in virtue of the authority given to himself, in the person of Peter, by God (Matt. xvi. 18), depriving Frederick of the empire, his kingdoms, and every office and dignity by sentence of excommunication. So too in the same constitution *c. 1 de Homic. in 6*, he laid down, with the approval of the Holy Council, that whatever ruler or prelate . . . have compassed . . . the death of any Christian by assassination, should by that very deed incur sentence of excommunication, be degraded from his dignity, office, etc., and be outlawed from the whole Christian world . . . so that all men are given power to kill him with impunity. See *Suarez de Fid. disp. xx., sect. 3, m. 23.*

“4. Bonif. VIII., Bull. *Unam Sanctam* among *Extrav. comm. l. 1, tit. 8, c. 1*; and confirmed in the Lateran Council under Leo X. ‘We are taught by the words of

the Gospels that temporal power too is included in it (the Church) and its authority. For when the Apostles said, *Lo here are two swords*, that is, in the Church when the Apostles were speaking, our Lord did not answer that they were too much, but that they were enough. Assuredly whoever denies the inclusion of the temporal sword in the power of Peter, misunderstands our Lord's word when He says: *Put up thy sword into its sheath*. So both the spiritual sword and the material sword are included in the power of the Church. But the latter must be employed in the service of the Church, the former by the Church. The latter must be wielded by the hand of the priest, the former by that of kings and soldiers, *but at the nod and will of the priest* [the italics are ours]. But one sword must be subordinated to the other, and the temporal power subjected to spiritual authority.' On these words we must note with Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontif.* in *Proleg.* § xix. n. vii., that the doctrine asserted, which agrees with that we uphold, should be carefully distinguished from the proof of it brought forward. For the assertion of doctrine is the function of his office, and the grace of infallibility has been promised if it is laid down *ex cathedra*. It is true that the doctrine asserted must always be supported by proofs drawn from the Word of God, but there is no need for those proofs to be expressly set forth. Perhaps merely probable reasoning may be adduced; or the word of God may be adduced, but, being somewhat obscurely expressed, in the shape of an interpretation resting on some proof, this interpretation being sufficiently old and so received, thus *attesting the common opinion of the Church on the matter in question*. Both of these things are done in the proof adduced by Bonif. VIII.; for that proof is verbally taken from *S. Bernard de Consideratione lib. 4, c. 3.* So the

Pope by using his very words (1) must be considered to have wished to bring forward his authority: and the authority of a single Doctor is at least a probable argument. *S. Th.*, 1 *p.q.* 1 *a* 8. Further, (2) the authority of Bernard was able to get that true interpretation generally accepted to exhibit the doctrine of the twofold power in the Church, which Bernard himself demonstrated in those words of the Gospel. So in putting forward that interpretation the Pope in reality appealed to the common feeling of the Church. *Urb. IV. Constitut. licet.* § 12 and *Innoc. IV. Constit. Adversus. Conc. dat.* iii. *Can.* 27; and *Praescriptio art.* 33 *Luth.* that the burning of heretics is against the will of the Holy Spirit.

“Hence it follows as a corollary, that if the Church has the right of inflicting the penalty of death, she has also the right of imposing and carrying out other corporal penalties. *Trid. sess. xxv. C. 3 de R.* says: ‘They (the ecclesiastical judges) are to have the authority of proceeding, if they think fit, in civil cases pertaining in any way to the ecclesiastical court, against any, even laymen, by a pecuniary fine (to be handed over to the local pious institutions as soon as collected), or by immediate seizure of property and detention of the person, to be carried out by their own or other officers, or even by depriving them of their benefices and by other legal means. . . . In criminal cases too, where execution on person or property can be carried out as above, one must abstain from condemnatory judgments.’ *C. 6 De Iudeis and c. 1 extrav. comm. eod. etc.* 10. *De Haeret.* and other passages, show the practice of the Church in inflicting the penalty of slavery, removal to another district, exile from some province, perpetual imprisonment, detention in a monas-

tery, flogging.—G. Pallavicino *Storia del Concil di Trento*, *Lib. 22, c. 9, n. 8.*”—*De Luca*, pp. 148–9.

The foregoing extracts are sufficient to prove decisively, not only that the Church of Rome has persecuted in the past, but that she is perfectly ready, whenever she gets the power, to continue the same savage rule.

Roman Catholic advocates have striven in vain to show that their Church was not responsible for the great persecutions which have stained so deeply her character in past days. Some of those persecutions, these advocates assert, were really undertaken for political purposes, and ought not to be laid to the charge of the Church itself. But in these volumes, written in the blaze of the twentieth century, the most despotic power is asserted as bestowed by Christ Himself upon the Church. In these volumes she reasserts all the most revolting claims of the Middle Ages, and quotes the actions of men in those days as justifying the Church, whenever she may be able, in exercising despotic power, and mercilessly persecuting heretics to the death. Everything, according to Rome's idea, must be done “according to the nod and will of the priest.” Other churches have at various times persecuted persons who dared to oppose their tenets. But no other church has ever claimed “Divine right” for such scandalous acts, or has laid down in her canon law so clearly the right and duty of persecution.

It would be easy to cite a number of Papal General Councils which have passed canons in favour of the persecution of heretics, such as the Third Lateran Council, which condemned the much-maligned Albigenses; or the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, which also commanded the extirpation of similar dissidents, and directed

that secular princes should be excommunicated if they refused to do their duty in the matter.

In the *Corpus Juris Canonici* put forth by order of Pope Gregory XIII., 1650, such canons and decrees are frequently quoted. See the *Decretales* of Pope Gregory IX. affixed to that volume, col. 642 ff. See also in same volume the Constitutions of Pope Clement V. in the Council of Vienne (held 1311-12), at col. 247, titulus iii.; the Extravagants of Pope John XXII., col. 381, 382 ff., titulus iii., "De hereticis"; and in same volume the *Instit. Juris Canon.*, titulus iv., "De hereticis et schismaticis," cols. 139, 140, 141.

It is unnecessary here to give any sketch of the Papal persecutions themselves, as, for instance, of the Marian persecution in England, of those in Scotland, or those of the Huguenots, etc.—all the water in the world cannot wash out the bloody stains of the Piedmontese persecutions; or of the massacre of St Bartholomew in France, on the occasion of which Pope Gregory struck his well-known medal in 1572.

What necessity is there for a recital of such deeds, or of a numbering up of the poor sufferers whose blood still cries out for vengeance, when the Church of Rome can venture unabashed in the twentieth century to endorse such a work as that of Marianus de Luca!

Just Published. Demy 8vo, Cloth, 7s. 6d. pp. 350.

# DANIEL AND HIS PROPHECIES

BY THE

REV. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D.

Trin. Coll., Dub.; M.A., Exeter Coll., Oxon.; Ph.D. of the University of Leipzig; Donnellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin (1880-1); Rampton Lecturer (1878); Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint (1891-2); and Public Examiner in Semitic Languages in the Honours School, University of Oxford (1894, 1895)

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.—THE BOOK OF DANIEL (a New Translation based on the Revised Version).—Chap. 1. THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN GENERAL.—Chap. 2. THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL, AND THE LATER WORKS REFERRING TO THE BOOK IN PRE-CHRISTIAN AND APOSTOLIC TIMES—§ 1. The Septuagint Version; § 2. The First Book of Maccabees; § 3. The Third Book of the Sibyllines; § 4. The Book of Ben Sira; § 5. The Book of Enoch—The Enoch Literature; § 6. Allusions in Judith and Tobit; § 7. The Book of Baruch—The Baruch Literature; § 8. Josephus; § 9. The Psalter of Solomon and the Assumption of Moses; § 10. The Book of 4 Esdras; § 11. The Book of Jubilees; § 12. The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers.—Chap. 3. THE HISTORICAL NARRATIVES OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL—§ 1. The opening chapter of Daniel, and Nebuchadnezzar's campaigns against Judah (Dan. i.); § 2. The Narrative of the Fiery Furnace (Dan. iii.); § 3. The Madness of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. iv.).—Chap. 4. THE HISTORICAL NARRATIVES OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL (*continued*)—§ 1. Belshazzar's feast and Babylon's overthrow (Dan. v.); § 2. Darius the Mede, and Daniel in the Lions' den (Dan. vi.).—Chap. 5. THE PROPHECIES OF THE FOUR KINGDOMS (Dan. ii. and vii.).—Chap. 6. THE PROPHECY ABOUT MEDIA, PERSIA, AND GREECE (Dan. viii.).—Chap. 7. THE PROPHECY OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS (Dan. ix. 24-27).—Chap. 8. THE LAST VISION OF DANIEL (Dan. xi. 1-10)—Persia and Greece; Wars between Syria and Egypt; Antiochus the Great and his Overthrow; Seleucus IV.—Chap. 9. THE LAST VISION OF DANIEL (*continued*) (Dan. xi. 20-40)—Antiochus Epiphanes and his Career.—Chap. 10. THE LAST VISION (*continued*) (Dan. xi. 40-vii.)—Contest and Final Victory.—GENERAL INDEX.—INDEX OF TEXTS SPECIALLY ILLUSTRATED.

"Dr Wright is to be congratulated on one of the most effective defences of the Book of Daniel that has yet been produced."—*Morning Post*.

"There is evidence in the present volume of most elaborate and thorough preparation for the work, and of an accurate scholarship which is certain to meet with due consideration."—Dr MARCUS DODS in *British Weekly*.

LONDON: WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 14 Henrietta St., Covent Garden. 1906.

BOSTON: LITTLE, BROWN & CO.

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF VICTORIA

By the same Author.

# DANIEL AND ITS CRITICS

BEING A CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY

Demy 8vo, Cloth, 7s. 6d. pp. 326.

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.—§ 1. Opening Remarks; § 2. The Defensive Character of the Work; § 3. The Prophecies of Daniel, etc.; § 4. The Doctrine of Christ's Kenosis; § 5. The Book of Sirach or Ben Sira; § 6. Literature of the Book of Daniel—1. Patristic—2. Jewish Expositors—

## DANIEL AND ITS CRITICS—Continued

3. Mediæval Commentators—4. Expositors of the Time of the Reformation—5. The Expositors of the 17th Century—6. Of the 18th Century—7. Of the 19th Century—8. Monographs—9. Roman Catholic Expositors—10. Apparatus Criticus—11. Introductions—12. Miscellaneous—13. Hebrew and Aramaic Grammars; § 7. Concluding Remarks.

CRITICAL AND GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY.—APPENDIX:—No. 1. Dr Salmon's Hypothesis concerning the LXX Translation of Daniel. No. 2. The Babylonian Contract Tablets. No. 3. The Public Ecclesiastical Law of the Roman Church on the Right and Duty of the Church to persecute Heretics. No. 4. Daniel and Zoroastrianism, by Rev. L. H. Mills, D.D. Professor of Zend Philology, University of Oxford.—GENERAL INDEX.—INDEX OF TERMS ILLUSTRATED OR EXPLAINED.

LONDON: WILLIAMS & NORGATE. 1906.

## THE BOOK OF ISAIAH AND OTHER HISTORICAL STUDIES

Crown 8vo, Cloth. Price 6s. net.

CONTENTS:—I. The Book of Isaiah. II. The Site of Paradise (with a Map). III. Human Sacrifices in the Old Testament. IV. The Malicious Custom of Human Sacrifices among the Jews. V. Great Jewish Rabbis of the First Century. VI. Martin Luther, the Hero of the Reformation. VII. Religious Life in the German Army in the War of 1870-1871. VIII. The Persecution of the Lutherans in the Baltic Provinces of Russia.

## THE INTERMEDIATE STATE

AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

*Examined in the light of Scripture, and of Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature.*

Price 5s.

“The subject of Prayers for the Dead has been in great need of thoroughly competent investigation. And now it has received it from the Rev. C. H. H. Wright, D.D., who has published his results in a thick crown 8vo. The whole of Jewish Apocryphal literature has been ransacked. Then the New Testament passages have been examined. The practice of the Fathers has been ascertained. And finally, the Christian Apocryphal Writings have been allowed to give evidence on the whole subject of the Intermediate State. Dr Wright claims to have done his work dispassionately. We admit the claim. He is a true scholar, a trifle timorous, perhaps, but always sensitive to the authority of the written Word.”—*Expository Times*.

LONDON: FRANCIS GRIFFITHS, 32 MAIDEN LANE, STRAND, W.C. 1906.